

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reexamination of the captioned application is respectfully requested.

#### **A. SUMMARY OF THIS AMENDMENT**

By the current amendment, Applicants basically:

1. Editorially amend the specification.
2. Editorially amend all claims.
3. Add new dependent claim 33.
4. Respectfully traverse the non-statutory rejection of claims 15 – 32 under 35 USC §101 in view, e.g., of claim amendments that delete “means” language.
5. Respectfully traverse all prior art rejections.

#### **B. NEW CLAIM 33**

New dependent claim 33 specifies that the act of transmitting a mode change request involving a change from a first compression mode to a second compression mode occurs after a compression process has started. Applicants deem this new claim supported by the totality of Applicants’ original disclosure, including page 9, lines 25 *et. seq* wherein it is clear that, for ROHC, the compression process has started since it starts in U-mode. The illustrative example implementation described on page 12, lines 7, refer to a ROHC embodiment which involves mode transition from U- or O- mode to R-mode. Therefore, to be in the initial mode (e.g., U mode) the compression has already started.

#### **C. PATENTABILITY OF THE CLAIMS**

Claims 1-12, 15-23 and 26-31 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,535,199 to Amri et al (see the paragraphs under the heading

“Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102” beginning on page 2 of the Office Action). Claims 13-14, 24-25 and 32 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,535,199 to Amri et al in view of U.S. Publication 2005/0195750 to Lee et al (see the paragraphs under the heading “Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103” beginning on page 5 of the Office Action). All claims rejections are traversed for at least the following reasons.

The office action primarily relies on U.S. Patent 5,535,199 to Amri et al and repeatedly cites col. 7, line 57 – col. 8, line 29 thereof. But this passage of U.S. Patent 5,535,199 to Amri et al primarily concerns a call setup request wherein a node which is requesting the call setup can specify (in a call request message) a desired compression scheme for the call. If this Call Request message (which specifies the desired compression scheme) is refused by the remote system/DTE, then a second call request will be attempted for an uncompressed connection.

In more detail, in the cited passage of U.S. Patent 5,535,199 to Amri et al a system/DTE which initiates the call uses use a specified Protocol identifier ("PID") in the User Data Field (516 in FIG. 10) of the Call Request Packet 500 to indicate that IP using RFC 1144 (the Van Jacobson scheme) is in use. If this Call Request containing the specific PID is refused by the remote system/DTE then a second call request will be attempted with the PID set to 0XCC, the standard PID for uncompressed TCP/IP.

Thus, there are significant differences between our Applicants' claimed subject matter and the disclosure of U.S. Patent 5,535,199 to Amri et al.

As a first example difference, the Applicants' claims pertain to a requested change from a first compression mode to a second compression mode. Armi, on the other hand, concerns a call setup request and an initial decision whether to use compression or not.

Armi does not address a situation in which, after an initial decision whether to use compression or not has been made, a header decompressor unit requests to change compression mode (from one type of compression to another type of compression). Requesting non-compression at call set up in the manner of U.S. Patent 5,535,199 to Amri et al is not changing between compression modes.

As a second significant difference, Armi does not teach or suggest a decompressor requesting (of a compressor) a change of any type, much less a compressor declining a change request of a decompressor.

Further, U.S. Patent 5,535,199 to Amri et al does not teach or suggest an implicit rejection, regardless of what unit may be viewed as the requester and which unit the refuser. Other subject matter which is recited in other dependent claims also is not addressed by U.S. Patent 5,535,199 to Amri et al.

The secondary reference (U.S. Publication 2005/0195750 to Lee et al) has apparently been cited only for its teaching of ROHC compression, and does not appear to compensate for the deficiencies of U.S. Patent 5,535,199 to Amri et al.

It is therefore respectfully requested that U.S. Patent 5,535,199 to Amri et al be withdrawn as a grounds for rejection, that all other rejections and objections be withdrawn, and that the captioned application be passed to issue.

#### **D. MISCELLANEOUS**

In view of the foregoing and other considerations, all claims are deemed in condition for allowance. A formal indication of allowability is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge the undersigned's deposit account #14-1140 in whatever amount is necessary for entry of these papers and the continued pendency of the captioned application.

Should the Examiner feel that an interview with the undersigned would facilitate allowance of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By:           /H. Warren Burnam, Jr./          

H. Warren Burnam, Jr.  
Reg. No. 29,366

HWB:lsh  
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22203-1808  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100